

Message

From: Kenny Crump [KennyCrump@email.com]
Sent: 8/1/2014 2:30:43 PM
To: Bussard, David [Bussard.David@epa.gov]; Subramaniam, Ravi [Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov]
CC: Jinot, Jennifer [Jinot.Jennifer@epa.gov]; chaochen25@comcast.net
Subject: RE: Bottom up letter
Attachments: Bottom up letter-NCEA 07-22-14 JJV RS2 DB2 (3) KSC.docx

I made a few suggested edits. In particular I thought the reference to “upward curving in the neighborhood of C0” needed to be replaced by ‘upward curving at endogenous exposures’ for the statement to be correct.
Kenny

Kenny S. Crump
Cell: 318-243-8431
KennyCrump@email.com

Home:
Kenny and Shirley Crump
2220 S. Vienna
Ruston, LA 71270
318-255-7058

From: Bussard, David [mailto:Bussard.David@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 1:37 PM
To: Subramaniam, Ravi; Kenny Crump
Cc: Jinot, Jennifer; chaochen25@comcast.net
Subject: RE: Bottom up letter

Jennifer indicated she will not be able to look at this until she is back from vacation in mid-August.

David

From: Subramaniam, Ravi
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 2:33 PM
To: Kenny Crump
Cc: Bussard, David; Jinot, Jennifer; chaochen25@comcast.net
Subject: FW: Bottom up letter

Kenny:

The letter went through further revisions, some significant, following upper management comments. I have not looked at this version yet. Please provide any comments to all in the cc: list. I am on vacation now but leave town only Saturday. Returning on 8-11.

Ravi.

Ravi Subramaniam, PhD; Associate, Quantitative Methods Branch, IRIS Division, NCEA-ORD, US EPA
(703) 347-8606 (Tu, W, Th); (301) 515-2701 (M, F)

From: Bussard, David
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2014 1:57 PM
To: Jinot, Jennifer; Subramaniam, Ravi; chaochen25@comcast.net
Subject: Bottom up letter

We got comments from John Vandenberg with many suggestions.

One of the most valuable points to me was to see how someone who does not already understand the argument can look at the original figure and somehow assume that the argument we are making depends on either a zero slope at zero endogenous ("a threshold"?) or a zero intercept on the vertical axis at zero endogenous (i.e., background is totally attributable to the chemical at hand). I think I have generated a revised figure that avoids that.

There are some other points re tone and re absolute statements I think we can take.

And, finally, it seems the paragraph or sentences about the whole approach relies upon a host of assumptions (while very true!) can become a distraction from the geometry point.

So, please take a look at revised, and let's see if we can all live with this.

David Bussard

I embedded the new figure in the Word file, but I will also attach the Powerpoint slide in which I made it. (And, I'll paste an image into email.)

Someone else may have better graphics options.

<< File: Graphic ver 2.pptx >> << File: Bottom up letter-NCEA 07-22-14 JJV RS2 DB2 (3).docx >>
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>